arXiv:1011.6447v1 [math.ST] 30 Nov 2010

WHEN DOES THE MEAN EXCESS PLOT LOOK LINEAR?

SOUVIK GHOSH AND SIDNEY I. RESNICK

Abstract. In risk analysis, the mean excess plot is a commonly used exploratory plotting technique for confirming iid data is consistent with a generalized Pareto assumption for the underlying distribution since in the presence of such a distribution, thresholded data have a mean excess plot that is roughly linear. Does any other class of distributions share this linearity of the plot? Under some extra assumptions, we are able to conclude that only the generalized Pareto family has this property.

1. Introduction

The mean excess (ME) plot is a diagnostic tool commonly used in risk analysis to justify fitting a generalized Pareto distribution (GPD)

$$G_{\xi,\beta}(x) = \begin{cases} 1-(1+\xi x/\beta)^{-1/\xi} & \text{if } \xi \neq 0 \\ 1-\exp(-x/\beta) & \text{if } \xi = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

to excesses over a large threshold. In (1.1) $\beta > 0$, and $x \geq 0$ when $\xi \geq 0$ and $0 \leq x \leq -\beta/\xi$ if $\xi < 0$. The parameters ξ and β are the *shape* and *scale* parameters respectively. For a Pareto distribution, the tail index α is just the reciprocal of ξ when $\xi > 0$. A special case is when $\xi = 0$ and in this case the GPD is the same as the exponential distribution with mean β. The use of the diagnostic is described in Embrechts et al. (1997, 2005); Davison and Smith (1990); Ghosh and Resnick (2010).

For a random variable X satisfying $EX^+ < \infty$ with distribution function $F(x)$ with right endpoint x_F and tail $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$, the ME function is

$$M(u) := E\big[X - u | X > u\big] = \frac{\int_u^{x_F} \bar{F}(s)ds}{\bar{F}(u)}, \qquad u < x_F. \tag{1.2}$$

The ME function is also known as the *mean residual life function*, especially in survival analysis (Benktander and Segerdahl, 1960). See Hall and Wellner (1981) for a discussion of properties. Table 3.4.7 in (Embrechts et al., 1997, p.161) gives the mean excess function for standard distributions. The important fact is that for a GPD distribution with $\xi < 1$, the ME function is linear with positive, negative or zero slope according to whether $0 < \xi < 1, \xi < 0$ or $\xi = 0$. More precisely, if the random variable X has GPD distribution $G_{\xi,\beta}$, we have $E(X) < \infty$ iff $\xi < 1$ and in this case, the ME function of X is

$$M(u) = \frac{\beta}{1-\xi} + \frac{\xi}{1-\xi}u, \tag{1.3}$$

where $0 \leq u < \infty$ if $0 \leq \xi < 1$ and $0 \leq u \leq -\beta/\xi$ if $\xi < 0$. In fact, the linearity of the mean excess function characterizes the GPD class. See Embrechts et al. (2005, 1997);

Date: December 1, 2010.

S. I. Resnick was partially supported by ARO Contract W911NF-10-1-0289 at Cornell University.

Davison and Smith (1990). This leads to the diagnostic of exploring the validity of the GPD assumption (or more broadly whether the underlying distribution is in the domain of attraction of a GPD distribution) by plotting an empirical estimate of the ME function called the ME plot and observing if (a) the plot looks linear, at least after some threshold, and if so, (b) whether the slope is positive, negative or zero.

Given an independent and identically distributed (iid) sample $X_1, \dots, X_n$ from $F(x)$, a natural estimate of $M(u)$ is the empirical ME function $\hat{M}(u)$ defined as

$$\hat{M}(u) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_i - u)I_{[X_i>u]}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} I_{[X_i>u]}}, \qquad u \geq 0. \tag{1.4}$$

The *ME plot* is the plot of the points $\{(X_{(k)}, \hat{M}(X_{(k)})) : 1 < k \leq n\}$, where $X_{(1)} \geq X_{(2)} \geq \cdots \geq X_{(n)}$ are the order statistics of the data. If the ME plot is close to linear for high values of the threshold then there is no evidence against use of a GPD model for the thresholded data. Ghosh and Resnick (2010) offered an explanation of why the ME plot from a GPD distribution with $\xi < 1$ should appear to be linear by considering the ME plot from a sample of size n as a random closed set in $\mathbb{R}^2$ indexed by n and showing convergence as $n \to \infty$ to a line segment in the Fell topology on the space of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$. For information about the Fell topology, Hausdorf metric and the topological space of closed subsets see Matheron (1975); Beer (1993); Molchanov (2005); Ghosh and Resnick (2010); Das and Resnick (2008). Of course, there are considerable practical difficulties interpreting the phrase *close to linear*. Das and Ghosh (2010) attempt to overcome this difficulty by using weak limits of these plots (when $0 < \xi < 1$) to construct confidence bands around the observed plot.

The results in Ghosh and Resnick (2010) say that if the underlying distribution of the underlying sample is in a domain of attraction, then the ME plot of the random sample should be linear. We state this precisely below. So these results state that approximate linearity of the ME plot is consistent with GPD or domain of attraction assumptions. However, these results do not rule out some other disjoint class of distributions giving a ME plot which is approximately linear. Thus it is the converse of the implications in Ghosh and Resnick (2010) which are the subject of this paper: If the ME plot is approximately linear, does this imply the underlying distribution is in a domain of attraction? We can give an affirmative answer subject to some assumptions. These converse investigations are related to some skilled investigations of David Mason; see for example Mason (1982).

1.1. Background.

For background on GPD distributions and domains of attraction see de Haan (1970); Resnick (2007, 2008); de Haan and Ferreira (2006); Embrechts et al. (1997). References for random closed sets have already been given. The class of regularly varying distributions with index $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by RV_ξ. To understand what converses are required, we restate the main sufficiency results from Ghosh and Resnick (2010). For these results, $\mathcal{F}$ is the space of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the Fell topology and $\overset{P}{\to}$ means convergence in probability in $\mathcal{F}$. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be iid with common distribution F, order statistics $X_{(1)} \geq X_{(2)} \geq \cdots \geq X_{(n)}$, and $k = k_n$ is *any* sequence satisfying $k \to \infty$ but $k/n \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$.

- If F satisfies $\bar{F} \in RV_{-1/\xi}$ with $0 < \xi < 1$, then in $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\mathcal{S}_n := \frac{1}{X_{(k)}} \Big\{ \big(X_{(i)}, \hat{M}(X_{(i)})\big) : i = 2, \dots, k \Big\} \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{S} := \Big\{ \Big(t, \frac{\xi}{1-\xi}t\Big) : t \geq 1 \Big\}. \tag{1.5}$$

- If F has finite right end point x_F and satisfies $1 - F(x_F - x^{-1}) \in RV_{1/\xi}$ as $x \to \infty$ for some $\xi < 0$, then in $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_n :&= \frac{1}{X_{(1)} - X_{(k)}} \Big\{ \Big(X_{(i)} - X_{(k)}, \hat{M}(X_{(i)}) \Big) : 1 < i \leq k \Big\} \\ &\xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{S} := \Big\{ \Big(t, \frac{\xi}{1-\xi}(t-1) \Big) : 0 \leq t \leq 1 \Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

- If F has right end point $x_F \leq \infty$ and is in the maximal domain of attraction of the Gumbel distribution, then in $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\mathcal{S}_n := \frac{1}{X_{(\lceil k/2 \rceil)} - X_{(k)}} \Big\{ \Big(X_{(i)} - X_{(k)}, \hat{M}(X_{(i)}) \Big) : 1 < i \leq k \Big\} \xrightarrow{P} \mathcal{S} := \Big\{ \big(t, 1 \big) : t \geq 0 \Big\}. \tag{1.7}$$

1.2. **Miscellany.** Throughout this paper we will take $k := k_n$ to be a sequence increasing to infinity such that $k_n/n \to 0$. For a distribution function $F(x)$ we write $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$ for the tail and the quantile function is

$$b(u) = F^{\leftarrow}(1 - \frac{1}{u}) = \inf\{s : F(s) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{u}\} = \Big(\frac{1}{1-F} \Big)^{\leftarrow}(u)$$

where $F^{\leftarrow}(u) := \inf\{x : F(x) \geq u\}$ is the left-continuous inverse of F.

A function $U : (0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is regularly varying with index $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, written $U \in RV_\rho$, if

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{U(tx)}{U(t)} = x^\rho, \quad x > 0.$$

A nondecreasing function U defined on an interval (x_l, x_0) is Γ-varying, written $U \in \Gamma$, if $\lim_{x \to x_0} U(x) = \infty$ and there exists a positive function f defined on (x_l, x_0) such that for all x

$$\lim_{t \to x_0} \frac{U(t + xf(t))}{U(t)} = e^x.$$

The function f is called an auxiliary function.

A nonnegative, nondecreasing function V defined on (x_l, ∞) is Π-varying, written $V \in \Pi$, if there exists $a(t) > 0, b(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for $x > 0$

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{V(tx) - b(t)}{a(t)} = \log x.$$

The function $a(t)$ is unique up to asymptotic equivalence and is called an auxiliary function. See de Haan (1970); Bingham et al. (1989); de Haan and Ferreira (2006); Resnick (2008) for details on regular variation, Γ-variation and Π-variation.

2. What if the ME plot converges?

We now attempt to draw conclusions from the assumption that the ME plot converges as $n \to \infty$. We need to phrase what we mean by *convergence of the ME plot* slightly differently in the three cases. For each case, there is an issue to resolve about convergence of random sets in (1.5), (1.6), (1.7) implying that a sequence of random variables converges. For instance, how do we conclude from (1.5) that

$$\frac{\hat{M}(X_{(k)})}{X_{(k)}} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{\xi}{1-\xi}? \tag{2.1}$$

Suppose for $k = k_n \to \infty$ we know that in $\mathcal{F}$

$$\mathcal{S}_n := \{(x_i(n), y_i(n)); 1 \le i \le k\} \to \mathcal{S} := \{(x, cx) : x \ge 1\}$$

for $c > 0$, and $x_i(n) \ge 1$, for all $1 \le i \le k$ and $n \ge 1$. Then using, for example, Das and Resnick (2008, Lemma 2.1.2), we have for large $M > 0$,

$$\mathcal{S}_n^M := \mathcal{S}_n \cap [0, M]^2 \to \mathcal{S}^M := \mathcal{S} \cap [0, M]^2,$$

and convergence in the Fell topology reduces to convergence with respect to the Hausdorf metric in the compact space $[0, M]^2$. Since $(1, c) \in \mathcal{S}^M$, there exist $(x_{i'}(n), y_{i'}(n)) \to (1, c)$ in $\mathcal{R}^2$ (Matheron, 1975; Das and Resnick, 2008; Ghosh and Resnick, 2010). Thus,

$$\wedge_{i=1}^k x_i(n) \le x_{i'}(n) \to 1.$$

Enclose $\mathcal{S}^M$ in a δ-neighborhood $(\mathcal{S}^M)^\delta$ and for sufficiently large n, $\mathcal{S}_n^M \subset (\mathcal{S}^M)^\delta$. Let $x^*(n) = \wedge_{i=1}^k x_i(n)$ be the x-value achieving the minimum and let $y^*(n)$ be the concomitant; ie, the y-value corresponding to $x^*(n)$. Then for large n, $(x^*(n), y^*(n)) \in (\mathcal{S}^M)^\delta$. Since $x^*(n)$ must be close to 1, $y^*(n)$ must be close to c. This shows (1.5) implies (2.1).

2.1. Frechét case.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose $X_1, \dots, X_n$ is an iid sample from a distribution F satisfying*

$$E\big[X_1^{1+\epsilon}\big] < \infty \qquad \text{for some } \epsilon > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

If for every sequence $k := k_n \to \infty$ such that $n/k \to \infty$ we have (1.5) so that

$$\frac{1}{kX_{(k+1)}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \Big(X_{(i)} - X_{(k+1)} \Big) \xrightarrow{P} \gamma := \frac{\xi}{1-\xi} > 0, \tag{2.3}$$

then $\bar{F} \in RV_{-1-1/\gamma}$, i.e., F is the maximal domain of attraction of the Frechét distribution.

Proof. We first claim that (2.3) implies F does not have a finite right end point. Suppose that is not true and there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(c) = 1$. Then we must have $X_{(k+1)} \xrightarrow{P} c$. That will imply $\hat{M}(X_{(k+1)}) \to 0$ which contradicts (2.3). Hence F can not have a finite right end point and in particular we get

$$P[X_{(k+1)} \le 1] \to 0 \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{2.4}$$

Next observe that

$$\frac{1}{kX_{(k+1)}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \Big(X_{(i)} - X_{(k+1)} \Big) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{X_{(i)}}{X_{(k+1)}} - 1$$

and therefore, using (2.3) and (2.4) it follows

$$V_n := \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{X_{(i)}}{X_{(k+1)}} I_{[X_{(k+1)} > 1]} \xrightarrow{P} \gamma + 1.$$

Since V_n is a nonnegative random random variable its Laplace transforms must also converge: For $\lambda > 0$

$$E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n\right)\Big] \to e^{-\lambda(\gamma+1)} \tag{2.5}$$

We will obtain a simplified expression for $E[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n\right)]$ in the next few steps. We begin by observing that

$$V_n \overset{d}{=} V_n^* := \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{X_{(i)}^*}{X_{(k+1)}^*} I_{[X_{(k+1)}^*>1]}$$

where

$$X_i^* = F^{\leftarrow}(U_i), \qquad U_1, \dots, U_n \sim \text{ iid } U[0,1],$$

$\overset{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution. Using the fact that conditioned on $U_{(k+1)}$ the order statistics $U_{(1)}, \dots, U_{(k)}$ are distributed like iid sample from $U[U_{(k+1)}, 1]$ (Maller and Resnick, 1984), we get

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n\right)\Big] &= E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n^*\right)\Big] = E\Big[E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n^*\right)\Big| U_{(k+1)}\Big]\Big] \\ &= E\left[\left(\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} \exp\left(-\lambda \frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x) I_{[X_{(k+1)}^*>1]}}{kX_{(k+1)}^*}\right) \frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right)^k\right] \\ &= E\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} k\left(1-\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x) I_{[X_{(k+1)}^*>1]}}{kX_{(k+1)}^*}\right)\right) \frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right)^k\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Observe that

$$\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{\infty} k\left(1-\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x) I_{[X_{(k+1)}^*>1]}}{kX_{(k+1)}^*}\right)\right) \frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}} \le k \qquad \text{almost surely.}$$

From Hall and Wellner (1979) we know that

$$\sup_{y\ge 0}\left|\left(1-\frac{y}{n}\right)^n I_{[0,n]}(y) - e^{-y}\right| \le \left(2+\frac{1}{n}\right) e^{-2}\frac{1}{n} = o(1) \tag{2.7}$$

and applying this to (2.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n\right)\Big] \\ &= E\left[\exp\left(-\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} k\left(1-\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x) I_{[X_{(k+1)}^*>1]}}{kX_{(k+1)}^*}\right)\right) \frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right)\right] + o(1) \\ &= E\left[\exp\left(-\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} k\left(1-\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x)}{kX_{(k+1)}^*}\right)\right) I_{[X_{(k+1)}^*>1]} \frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right)\right] + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Choose $0 < \epsilon < 1$ satisfying (2.2). We claim that if the sequence k satisfies $k \to \infty$ and $n/k \to \infty$ along with $n/k^{1+\epsilon} \to 0$ (for example $k = n^{1/(2(1+\epsilon))}$) then

$$E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n\right)\Big] = E\left[\exp\left(-\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} \lambda \frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x)}{X_{(k+1)}^*} I_{[X_{(k+1)}^*>1]} \frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right)\right] + o(1). \tag{2.9}$$

Using (2.8) and the fact that $|e^{-a}-e^{-b}|\le|a-b|$ for all $a,b\ge 0$ it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} G_n :=& E\left|\left[\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^1 k\left(1-\exp\left(-\lambda\frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x)}{kX^*_{(k+1)}}\right)\right) I_{[X^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right.\right.\\ &\left.\left. - \int_{U_{(k+1)}}^1 \lambda\frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x)}{X^*_{(k+1)}} I_{[X^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right]\right| \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Get $0<\epsilon\le 1$ such that (2.2) holds. Since $|1-e^{-x}-x|\le x^{1+\epsilon}$ for all $x>0$, we obtain a bound for G_n:

$$\begin{aligned} G_n &\le k\lambda^{1+\epsilon}E\left[\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^1 \left(\frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x)}{kX^*_{(k+1)}}\right)^{1+\epsilon} I_{[X^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right]\\ &\le k^{-\epsilon}\lambda^{1+\epsilon}E\left[\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^1 F^{\leftarrow}(x)^{1+\epsilon} I_{[X^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right]\\ &\le k^{-\epsilon}\lambda^{1+\epsilon}E\Big[X_1^{1+\epsilon}I_{[X_1>1]}\Big]E\Big[\frac{1}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

The form of $E[(1-U_{(k+1)})^{-1}]$ can be easily obtained using the Rényi representation (Resnick, 2007, p.110). Recall that if $U\sim U[0,1]$ then $(1-U)^{-1}\sim$ Pareto(1) and therefore

$$\frac{1}{1-U_{(k+1)}} \overset{d}{=} e^{E_{(k+1)}}$$

where $E_{(k+1)}$ is the $(k+1)$-th order statistic of an iid sample from an exponential distribution with mean 1. Using the Rényi representation

$$E\left[\frac{1}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right] = E\left[e^{E_{(k+1)}}\right] = E\left[\prod_{i=1}^{n-k-1} e^{E_i/(n-i+1)}\right]$$

where $E_1,\dots,E_n \sim$iid Exp(1). This implies

$$E\left[\frac{1}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right] = \prod_{i=1}^{n-k-1}\frac{n-i+1}{n-i} = \frac{n}{k+1}$$

therefore from (2.10) and (2.11) we get

$$G_n \le \lambda^{1+\epsilon}E\Big[X_1^{1+\epsilon}I_{[X_1>1]}\Big]\frac{n}{k^{1+\epsilon}}.$$

Thus, $G_n\to 0$ if $n/k^{1+\epsilon}\to 0$. This proves the claim (2.9).

Using (2.9) and (2.5) we get that

$$H(U_{(k+1)}) \xrightarrow{P} \gamma+1 \tag{2.12}$$

whenever $n,k\to\infty$ with $n/k\to 0$ and $n/k^{1+\epsilon}\to\infty$, where

$$H(y) := \int_y^1 \frac{F^{\leftarrow}(x)}{F^{\leftarrow}(y)(1-y)}dx.$$

We claim that (2.12) implies

$$H(y) \to \gamma + 1 \qquad \text{as } y \to 1, \tag{2.13}$$

and we will prove it by contradiction. Write

$$N_n = \frac{n}{\sqrt{k}}\left(U_{(k+1)} - \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)\right)$$

and note that $N_n \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2)$ for some $\sigma^2 > 0$, see Balkema and De Haan (1975). We know that

$$H\left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{n}N_n + 1 - \frac{k}{n}\right) \to \gamma + 1 \qquad \text{as } n, k, \frac{n}{k}, \frac{k^{1+\epsilon}}{n} \to \infty.$$

If possible suppose (2.13) is not true and there exists $\delta > 0$ and $(z_m^{(2)})$ such that $z_m^{(2)} \to 1$ and

$$\left|H(z_m^{(2)}) - \gamma\right| > 2\delta.$$

Since H is left continuous there exists $(z_m^{(1)})$ such that $z_m^{(1)} < z_m^{(2)}$, $z_m^{(1)} \to 1$ and

$$|H(y) - \gamma| > \delta \qquad \text{for all } y \in (z_m^{(1)}, z_m^{(2)}).$$

For every $m \geq 1$ choose $n(m)$ such that

$$n(m)^{\epsilon}(1 - z_m^{(1)})^{1+\epsilon} \geq n(m)^{\epsilon/2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad n(m)(z_m^{(2)} - z_m^{(1)}) \geq 1 + \sqrt{\lfloor n(m)(1 - z_m^{(1)})\rfloor}$$

and define $k(n(m)) = \lfloor n(m)(1 - z_m^{(1)})\rfloor$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&k(n(m)) \geq n(m)^{\epsilon}(1 - z_m^{(1)})^{1+\epsilon} \geq n(m)^{\epsilon/2} \to \infty,\\
&k(n(m))/n(m) \sim 1 - z_m^{(1)} \to 0, \qquad \text{and}\\
&k(n(m))^{1+\epsilon}/n(m) \sim n(m)^{\epsilon}(1 - z_m^{(1)})^{1+\epsilon} \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we also get

$$y_m^{(1)} := 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)} \geq z_m^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad y_m^{(2)} := 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)} + \frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)} \leq z_m^{(2)}.$$

Now observe that with this construction

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[\left|H\left(\frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)}N_{n(m)} + 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)}\right) - \gamma\right| > \delta\right]\\
&\geq \liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[\frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)}N_{n(m)} + 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)} \in \left(z_m^{(1)}, z_m^{(2)}\right)\right]\\
&\geq \liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[\frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)}N_{n(m)} + 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)} \in \left(y_m^{(1)}, y_m^{(2)}\right)\right]\\
&= \liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[N_{n(m)} \in (0,1)\right] = P[N(0,\sigma^2) \in (0,1)] > 0
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2.12).

Now finally we show that (2.13) implies that $\bar{F} \in RV_{-1-1/\gamma}$. It suffices to show that $b(u) := F^{\leftarrow}(1-1/u) \in RV_{\gamma/(\gamma+1)}$. Note that from (2.13) we get that

$$\frac{1}{yb(y)/y^2}\int_y^\infty \frac{b(u)}{u^2}du \to \gamma+1 \qquad \text{as } y \to \infty.$$

By Karamata's Theorem (Resnick, 2007, Theorem 2.1, p.25) this imples that $b(u)/u^2 \in RV_{-(\gamma+2)/(\gamma+1)}$ and hence $b(u) \in RV_{\gamma/(\gamma+1)}$. Hence the proof is complete. □

2.2. **Weibull case.** To deal with this case, we found it necessary to assume a bit more than (1.6) because we want to replace $X_{(1)}$ by the right endpoint of the underlying distribution.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose $X_1, \dots, X_n$ is an iid sample from a distribution F. If there exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ such for every sequence $k := k_n \to \infty$ satisfying $n/k \to \infty$*

$$\frac{1}{k(\kappa - X_{(k+1)})}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(X_{(i)} - X_{(k+1)}\Big) \xrightarrow{P} \gamma > 0, \tag{2.14}$$

then κ is the right end point of F and $\bar{F}(\kappa - 1/\cdot) \in RV_{1-1/\gamma}$, i.e., F is in the maximal domain of the Weibull distribution.

The parameter γ plays the role of $-\xi/(1-\xi)$ in (1.6).

Proof. Suppose $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the right end point of F. If $\kappa < \kappa_0$ then

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \kappa - X_{(k)} < 0 \qquad \text{a.s.}$$

and hence (2.14) can not hold. Therefore we must have $\kappa \geq \kappa_0$. On the other hand if $\kappa > \kappa_0$ then κ_0 is the finite right end point and hence we will have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \kappa - X_{(k)} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad X_{(1)} - X_{(k)} \to 0 \qquad \text{a.s.}$$

In this case also (2.14) can not hold for $\gamma > 0$. Therefore $\kappa = \kappa_0$ must be the finite right end point of the distribution F. Also note that (2.14) implies $0 < \gamma < 1$ since $\kappa - X_{(i)} \leq \kappa - X_{(k)}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

The rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.1. Observe that (2.14) implies

$$V_n := \frac{Z_{(k)}}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\frac{1}{Z_{(i)}} \xrightarrow{P} 1-\gamma, \tag{2.15}$$

where $Z_i = (\kappa - X_i)^{-1}$. Using the arguments leading to (2.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n\right)\Big] \\ &= E\left[\exp\left(-\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} k\left(1-\exp\left(-\lambda\frac{Z^*_{(k+1)}}{kF_Z^{\leftarrow}(x)}\right)\right) I_{[Z^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right)\right] + o(1), \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$Z_i^* = F_Z^{\leftarrow}(U_i), \qquad U_1, \dots, U_n \sim \text{ iid } U[0,1],$$

and F_Z is the cumulative distribution function of Z_1. Furthermore, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left|\left[\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} k\left(1-\exp\left(-\lambda\frac{Z^*_{(k+1)}}{kF_Z^{\leftarrow}(x)}\right)\right)I_{[Z^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right.\right.\\
&\left.\left.-\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1}\lambda\frac{Z^*_{(k+1)}}{kF_Z^{\leftarrow}(x)}I_{[Z^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right]\right|\\
&\le k\lambda^2 E\left[\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1}\left(\frac{Z^*_{(k+1)}}{kF_Z^{\leftarrow}(x)}\right)^2 I_{[Z^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right]\\
&\le k^{-1}\lambda^2 E\Big[\frac{1}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\Big]\to 0 \qquad (2.17)
\end{aligned}$$

if $k\to\infty$ satisfying $n/k\to\infty$ and $n/k^2\to 0$. Therefore, for such a sequence k we get

$$E\Big[\exp\left(-\lambda V_n\right)\Big]=E\left[\exp\left(-\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1}\lambda\frac{Z^*_{(k+1)}}{F_Z^{\leftarrow}(x)}I_{[Z^*_{(k+1)}>1]}\frac{dx}{1-U_{(k+1)}}\right)\right]+o(1). \qquad (2.18)$$

Since $V_n\overset{P}{\to}1-\gamma$ we get

$$H(U_{(k)})\overset{P}{\to}1-\gamma \qquad (2.19)$$

whenever $n,k\to\infty$ with $n/k\to 0$ and $n/k^2\to\infty$, where

$$H(y):=\int_y^1\frac{F_Z^{\leftarrow}(y)}{F_Z^{\leftarrow}(x)(1-y)}dx.$$

The arguments following (2.13) gives us

$$b_Z(u):=F_Z^{\leftarrow}(1-1/u)\in RV_{\gamma/(1-\gamma)}$$

which implies $\bar{F}_Z\in RV_{1-1/\gamma}$ and that completes the proof. □

2.3. **Gumbel case.** For a converse to (1.7), we found it difficult to deal with dividing by $X_{(\lceil k/2\rceil)}-X_{(k)}$. However, we were expecting Π-varying behavior for this difference and expected this difference to be of the order of a slowly varying auxiliary function familiar in the theory of Π-varying functions. In (1.7), if we replace division by $X_{(\lceil k/2\rceil)}-X_{(k)}$ with division by a slowly varying function, the following partial converse of (1.7) emerges, which represents a generalization of a result of Mason (1982).

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose $X_1,\dots,X_n$ is an iid sample from a distribution F satisfying $E[X_1^+]<\infty$. Suppose there exists $a(t)\in RV_0$ such that for every sequence $k:=k_n\to\infty$ with $n/k\to\infty$*

$$\frac{1}{ka(n/k)}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(X_{(i)}-X_{(k+1)}\Big)\overset{P}{\to}1. \qquad (2.20)$$

Then $F\in MDA(\Lambda)$, i.e., F is in the maximal domain of attraction of the Gumbel distribution.

Proof. We begin by observing that without loss of any generality we can take the function $a(t)$ to be continuous; see Karamata's repreentation (Resnick, 2007, Corollary 2.1, p.29). Following the notation used in the proof of Theorem 2.1, set $X_i^* = F^{\leftarrow}(U_i) \stackrel{d}{=} X_i$ where $U_1, \dots, U_n$ are iid $U(0,1)$. For any $0 < x < 1$, define $Z_i(x) := F^{\leftarrow}(V_i(x)), i \geq 1$, where $V_i(x), i \geq 1$, are iid $U[x,1]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{ka(n/k)}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(X_{(i)} - X_{(k+1)}\Big) &\stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{ka(n/k)}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(X^*_{(i)} - X^*_{(k+1)}\Big)\\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{ka(n/k)}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(Z_i(U_{(k+1)}) - X^*_{(k+1)}\Big) \stackrel{P}{\to} 1.\end{aligned}$$

Using (2.20) we get for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left[\Big|\frac{1}{ka(n/k)}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(X_{(i)} - X_{(k+1)}\Big) - 1\Big| > \epsilon\right]\\ &E\left[P\left[\Big|\frac{1}{ka(n/k)}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(Z_i(U_{(k+1)}) - X^*_{(k+1)}\Big) - 1\Big| > \epsilon\Big|U_{(k+1)}\right]\right] \to 0\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$P\left[\Big|\frac{1}{ka(n/k)}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\Big(Z_i(U_{(k+1)}) - X^*_{(k+1)}\Big) - 1\Big| > \epsilon\Big|U_{(k+1)}\right] \stackrel{P}{\to} 0.$$

Then for a subsequence $k' := k'_n$ of k_n we have

$$P\left[\Big|\frac{1}{k'a(n/k')}\sum_{i=1}^{k'}\Big(Z_i(U_{(k'+1)}) - X^*_{(k'+1)}\Big) - 1\Big| > \epsilon\Big|U_{(k'+1)}\right] \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} 0.$$

Using relative stability and Gnedenko and Kolmogorov (1968, Theorem 2, §2.7, p. 140) we then get

$$k'P\left[Z_1(U_{(k'+1)}) > X^*_{(k'+1)} + \epsilon k'a(n/k')\Big|U_{(k'+1)}\right] \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} 0 \tag{2.21}$$

and

$$k'E\left[\frac{Z_1(U_{(k'+1)}) - X^*_{(k'+1)}}{k'a(n/k')} I_{[0 \leq Z_1(U_{(k'+1)}) - X^*_{(k'+1)} \leq \epsilon k'a(n/k')]}\Bigg|U_{(k'+1)}\right] \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} 1. \tag{2.22}$$

From (2.22) we get

$$\frac{1}{a(n/k')(1-U_{(k'+1)})}\int_{0 \leq F^{\leftarrow}(s) - X^*_{(k'+1)} \leq \epsilon k'a(n/k')} F^{\leftarrow}(s)ds \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} 1$$

and then using (2.21) and the assumption that $E\big[X_1^+\big] < \infty$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{a(n/k')(1-U_{(k'+1)})}\int_{U_{(k'+1)}}^{1} F^{\leftarrow}(s)ds \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} 1. \tag{2.23}$$

Observe that this also implies

$$\frac{1}{a(n/k)(1-U_{(k+1)})}\int_{U_{(k+1)}}^{1} F^{\leftarrow}(s)ds \xrightarrow{P} 1. \tag{2.24}$$

Now set

$$H(x) := \frac{1}{1-x}\int_{x}^{1} F^{\leftarrow}(s)ds \qquad \text{for all } 0<x<1 \tag{2.25}$$

and then (2.24) implies

$$\frac{H(U_{(k+1)})}{a(n/k)} \xrightarrow{P} 1. \tag{2.26}$$

We now prove that (2.26) implies

$$g(t) := \frac{H(1-1/t)}{a(t)} \to 1 \qquad \text{as } t\to\infty \tag{2.27}$$

and for that we use the same technique used in the proof of Theorem 2.1. If (2.27) is not true then given any $\delta>0$ we can get a sequence $1<t_m^{(2)}\to\infty$ such that

$$\left|g\big(t_m^{(2)}\big)-1\right| > 2\delta.$$

Using the continuity of $H(\cdot)$ and $a(\cdot)$ we can get $1<t_m^{(1)}<t_m^{(2)}$ with $t_m^{(1)}\to\infty$ such that

$$\left|\frac{H\left(1-1/y\right)}{a(x)}-1\right| > \delta \qquad \text{for all } x,y\in\big(t_m^{(1)},t_m^{(2)}\big).$$

Now for every $m\geq 1$ get $n(m)$ large enough such that

$$n(m)\geq \big(t_m^{(1)}\big)^2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad n(m)\left(\frac{1}{t_m^{(2)}}-\frac{1}{t_m^{(1)}}\right)\geq 1+\sqrt{\frac{n(m)}{t_m^{(1)}}}.$$

Also define $k(n(m)) = \lfloor n(m)/t_m^{(1)}+1\rfloor$ and note that for all $m\geq 1$ we get $n(m)/k(n(m))\in \big(t_m^{(1)},t_m^{(2)}\big)$ and

$$y_m^{(1)} := 1-\frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)} \geq 1-\frac{1}{t_m^{(1)}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad y_m^{(2)} := 1-\frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)}+\frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)} \leq 1-\frac{1}{t_m^{(2)}}$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2.1, write

$$N_n = \frac{n}{\sqrt{k}}\left(U_{(k+1)}-\left(1-\frac{k}{n}\right)\right)$$

and then $N_n \Rightarrow N(0,\sigma^2)$ for some $\sigma^2 > 0$ from Balkema and De Haan (1975). Now observe that with this construction

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[\left| a\left(\frac{n(m)}{k(n(M))}\right)^{-1} H\left(\frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)} N_{n(m)} + 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)}\right) - 1\right| > \delta\right] \\
&\geq \liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[\frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)} N_{n(m)} + 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)} \in \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_m^{(1)}}, 1 - \frac{1}{t_m^{(2)}}\right)\right] \\
&\geq \liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[\frac{\sqrt{k(n(m))}}{n(m)} N_{n(m)} + 1 - \frac{k(n(m))}{n(m)} \in \left(y_m^{(1)}, y_m^{(2)}\right)\right] \\
&= \liminf_{m\to\infty} P\left[N_{n(m)} \in (0,1)\right] = P[N(0,\sigma^2) \in (0,1)] > 0
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2.26).

In the last step of the proof we show that (2.27) implies $F \in MDA(\Lambda)$. Let $\kappa := F^{\leftarrow}(1)$ denote the right end point of F. Set

$$f(x) = \int_x^\kappa \frac{\bar F(s)}{\bar F(x)} ds \qquad \text{for all } x < \kappa, \tag{2.28}$$

and note that (2.27) implies $f(b(t)) \sim a(t) \in RV_0$ where $b(t) := F^{\leftarrow}(1-1/t)$. Also observe that (2.28) is equivalent to

$$f(x)\bar F(x) = \int_x^\kappa \bar F(s)ds = c\exp\left\{-\int_1^x \frac{1}{f(s)}ds\right\} \qquad \text{for all } x < \kappa \tag{2.29}$$

for some $c > 0$. We claim that $\int_x^\kappa \bar F(s)ds$ is tail equivalent to a distribution in the Gumbel maximal domain of attraction, i.e., there exists a distribution $F_1 \in MDA(\Lambda)$ such that

$$\frac{\int_x^\kappa \bar F(s)ds}{\bar F_1(x)} \to 1 \qquad \text{as } x \to \kappa.$$

Following (Resnick, 2008, Proposition 0.10, p.28) it suffices to check that

$$V(x) := \frac{c}{\int_x^\kappa \bar F(s)ds} = \exp\left\{\int_1^x \frac{1}{f(s)}ds\right\} \in \Gamma$$

or $V^{\leftarrow} \in \Pi$. By (Resnick, 2008, Proposition 0.11, p.30) we know that it is enough to verify $(V^{\leftarrow})' \in RV_{-1}$. Observe that

$$(V^{\leftarrow}(x))' = \frac{1}{V'\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)} = \frac{f\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)}{V\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)} \sim \frac{f\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)}{x} \sim \frac{a\left(b^{\leftarrow}\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)\right)}{x}.$$

Since

$$V(b(x)) = \frac{1}{\bar F(b(x))f(b(x))} \sim \frac{x}{a(x)} \in RV_1$$

we get that $b^{\leftarrow}\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right) \in RV_1$. Furthermore, since $a \in RV_0$ this implies $a\left(b^{\leftarrow}\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)\right) \in RV_0$ and $a\left(b^{\leftarrow}\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)\right)/x \in RV_{-1}$. By (Resnick, 2008, Proposition 0.11, p.30) this implies $V^{\leftarrow} \in \Pi$ with auxiliary function $a\left(b^{\leftarrow}\left(V^{\leftarrow}(x)\right)\right)$ and (Resnick, 2008, Proposition 0.9, p.27) then gives us that $V \in \Gamma$ with auxiliary function

$$a(b^{\leftarrow}(V^{\leftarrow}(V(x)))) \sim a(b^{\leftarrow}(x)) \sim f(b(b^{\leftarrow}(x))) \sim f(x).$$

This implies that $f(x)$ is a suitable auxiliary function for $\int_x^\kappa \bar{F}(s)ds$. From de Haan theory (Resnick (2008, Proposition 1.9, p.48), de Haan (1970)) we know that

$$\frac{\int_x^\kappa \int_s^\kappa \bar{F}(y)dyds}{\int_x^\kappa \bar{F}(s)ds}$$

is an auxiliary function for $\int_x^\kappa \bar{F}(s)ds$. Furthermore, (Resnick, 2008, Proposition 1.9, p.48), we also have

$$\frac{\int_x^\kappa \int_s^\kappa \bar{F}(y)dyds}{\int_x^\kappa \bar{F}(s)ds} \sim f(x) = \frac{\int_x^\kappa \bar{F}(s)ds}{\bar{F}(x)}$$

which proves that $F \in MDA(\Lambda)$ (de Haan, 1970). □

3. Acknowledgement

A long time ago in a galaxy far away, Gennady Samorodnitsky provided assistance with a subsequence argument that was very helpful for the present paper.

References

Balkema, A., De Haan, L., 1975. Limit laws for order statistics. In: Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai. Limit Theorems of Probability. Vol. 11. pp. 17–22.

Beer, G. A., 1993. Topologies on Closed and Closed Convex Sets. Springer.

Benktander, G., Segerdahl, C., 1960. On the analytical representation of claim distributions with special reference to excess of loss reinsurance. In: XVIth International Congress of Actuaries, Brussels. pp. 626–636.

Bingham, N. H., Goldie, C. M., Teugels, J. L., 1989. Regular Variation. Cambridge University Press.

Das, B., Ghosh, S., 2010. Weak limits for exploratory plots in the analysis of extremes. Arxiv:1008.2639.

Das, B., Resnick, S., 2008. Qq plots, random sets and data from a heavy tailed distribution. Stochastic Models 24 (1), 103–132.

Davison, A., Smith, R., 1990. Models for exceedances over high thresholds. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B 52 (3), 393–42.

de Haan, L., 1970. On Regular Variation and Its Application to the Weak Convergence of Sample Extremes. Mathematisch Centrum Amsterdam.

de Haan, L., Ferreira, A., 2006. Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Embrechts, P., Klüppelberg, C., Mikosch, T., 1997. Modelling Extremal Events. Vol. 33 of Applications in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Embrechts, P., McNeil, A. J., Frey, R., 2005. Quantitative Risk Management: Concepts, Techniques, and Tools. Princeton University Press.

Ghosh, S., Resnick, S., 2010. A discussion on mean excess plots. Stochastic Processes and their Applications 120 (8), 1492–1517.

Gnedenko, B., Kolmogorov, A., 1968. Limit distributions for sums of independent random variables. Addison-Wesley Reading.

Hall, W., Wellner, J., 1979. The rate of convergence in law of the maximum of an exponential sample. Statistica Neerlandica 33 (3), 151–154.

Hall, W., Wellner, J., 1981. Mean residual life. Statistics and Related Topics, 169–184.

Maller, R., Resnick, S., 1984. Limiting behaviour of sums and the term of maximum modulus. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 3 (3), 385–422.
Mason, D., 1982. Laws of large numbers for sums of extreme values. Ann. Probab. 10, 754–764.
Matheron, G., 1975. Random Sets and Integral Geometry. Wiley, New York.
Molchanov, I. S., 2005. Theory of Random Sets. Springer.
Resnick, S. I., 2007. Heavy-Tail Phenomena: Probabilistic And Statistical Modeling. Springer.
Resnick, S. I., 2008. Extreme Values, Regular Variation and Point Processes. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York.

Department of Statistics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.
E-mail address: `ghosh@stat.columbia.edu`

School of Operations Research and Information Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.
E-mail address: `sir1@cornell.edu`